arXiv:1607.00033v1 [math.CO] 30 Jun 2016

Graphical Mahonian Statistics on Words

Amy Grady and Svetlana Poznanović[1]

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634

Abstract

Foata and Zeilberger defined the graphical major index, maj'_U, and the graphical inversion index, inv'_U, for words. These statistics are a generalization of the classical permutation statistics maj and inv indexed by directed graphs U. They showed that maj'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed over all rearrangement classes if and only if U is bipartitional. In this paper we strengthen their result by showing that if maj'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed on a single rearrangement class then U is essentially bipartitional. Moreover, we define a graphical sorting index, sor'_U, which generalizes the sorting index of a permutation. We then characterize the graphs U for which sor'_U is equidistributed with inv'_U and maj'_U on a single rearrangement class.

1 Introduction

Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ be a sequence of nonnegative integers. We will denote by $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ the set of permutations of the multiset $\{1^{\alpha_1}, 2^{\alpha_2}, \ldots, n^{\alpha_n}\}$, i.e., $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is the set of all words containing α_i occurrences of the letter i for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. For $w = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_m \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, the *inversion number* is defined as

$$\mathrm{inv}\, w = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le m} \mathcal{X}(x_i > x_j),$$

and the *major index* is defined as

$$\mathrm{maj}\, w = \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} i\mathcal{X}(x_i > x_{i+1}).$$

The set of all positions i such that $x_i > x_{i+1}$ is known as the *descent set* of w, $\mathrm{Des}\, w$, and its cardinality is denoted by $\mathrm{des}\, w$. So, $\mathrm{maj}\, w = \sum_{i \in \mathrm{Des}\, w} i$.

The generating function for permutations by number of inversions goes back to Rodriguez [19] and the generalization to multisets is due to MacMahon [14]. MacMahon also showed [13, 15] that maj and inv are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Namely,

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{inv}\, w} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{maj}\, w} = \left[\begin{array}{c} \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n \\ \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n \end{array} \right]$$

E-mail addresses: agrady@clemson.edu (A. Grady), spoznan@clemson.edu (S. Poznanović)

[1]The second author is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1312817.

where

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \alpha_1+\alpha_2+\ldots+\alpha_k \\ \alpha_1,\alpha_2,\ldots,\alpha_k \end{array} \right] = \frac{[\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\cdots+\alpha_k]!}{[\alpha_1]![\alpha_2]!\ldots[\alpha_k]!}$$

is the q-analog of the multinomial coefficient and $[n]! = (1+q)(1+q+q^2)\cdots(1+q+q^2+\cdots+q^{n-1})$ is the q-factorial.

In honor of MacMahon, all permutation statistics that share the same distribution are called Mahonian. These two classical Mahonian statistics have been generalized in various ways. Some examples are Kadell's weighted inversion number [11], the r-major index introduced by Rawlings [18], the statistics introduced by Clarke [3], and the maj-inv statistics of Kasraoui [12]. The generalization that we will be considering in this paper is due to Foata and Zeilberger [7]. They defined graphical statistics (graphical inversions and graphical major index) parameterized by a general directed graph U and they described the graphs U for which these statistics are equidistributed on *all* rearrangement classes.

Theorem 1.1 ([7]). *The statistics* inv'_U *and* maj'_U *are equidistributed on each rearrangement class* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *if and only if the relation* U *is bipartitional.*

A similar result was proved in [6], where the definition of graphical inversions and major index is modified to allow different behavior of the letters at the end of the word.

Here we do two different things. First, we strengthen Foata and Zeilberger's result by showing that the equidistribution of inv'_U and maj'_U on a *single* rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ implies that U is essentially bipartitional (Theorem 2.1). Second, we define a graphical sorting index on words, a statistics which generalizes the sorting index for permutations [16]. We then describe the directed graphs U for which sor'_U is equidistributed with inv'_U and maj'_U on a fixed class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ (Theorem 2.2).

In the next section we define the terminology we need and state the main results. Then we prove Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively.

2 Preliminaries and Main Results

A *directed graph* on $X = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ is any subset U of the Cartesian product $X \times X$. For each such directed graph U, we have the following statistics defined on each word $w = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_m$ with letters from X:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{inv}'_U\, w &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le m} \mathcal{X}((x_i,x_j)\in U), \\ \mathrm{Des}'_U\, w &= \{i\colon 1\le i\le m, (x_i,x_{i+1})\in U\}, \\ \mathrm{des}'_U\, w &= |\,\mathrm{Des}'_U\,|, \\ \mathrm{maj}'_U\, w &= \sum_{i\in \mathrm{Des}'_U\, w} i. \end{aligned}$$

Since U is also a relation on X, for convenience, in some places we will use the notation $x >_U y$ to represent the edge $(x, y) \in U$. We will say x is related to y if $(x, y) \in U$ or $(y, x) \in U$.

An *ordered bipartition* of X is a sequence $(B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k)$ of nonempty disjoint subsets of X such that $B_1 \cup B_2 \cup \cdots \cup B_k = X$, together with a sequence $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_k)$ of elements equal to

0 or 1. If $\beta_i = 0$ we say the subset B_i is *non-underlined*, and if $\beta_i = 1$ we say the subset B_i is *underlined*.

A relation U on $X \times X$ is said to be *bipartitional*, if there exists an ordered bipartition $((B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k), (\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_k))$ such that $(x, y) \in U$ if and only if either $x \in B_i$, $y \in B_j$ and $i < j$, or x and y belong to the same underlined block B_i. Bipartitional relations were introduced in [7] as an answer to the question "When are inv'_U and maj'_U equidistributed over all rearrangement classes?". In particular, there the authors showed that if U is bipartitional with blocks $((B_1, \ldots, B_k), (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k))$ then

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_U w} = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{maj}'_U w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ m_1, \ldots, m_k \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \binom{m_l}{\alpha(B_l)} q^{\beta_j \binom{m_j}{2}}. \tag{2.1}$$

Here and later we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned} |\boldsymbol{\alpha}| &= \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n, \\ m_i &= |B_i|, \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}(B_i) &= (\alpha_{i_1}, \ldots, \alpha_{i_l}) \text{ if } B_i = \{i_1 < \cdots < i_l\}. \end{aligned}$$

Han [9] showed that bipartitional relations U can also be characterized as relations U for which both U and its complement are transitive. Hetyei and Krattenthaler [10] showed that the poset of bipartitional relations ordered by inclusions has nice combinatorial properties.

In this paper we will be considering the distribution of inv'_U and maj'_U over a fixed rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Notice that if the multiplicity α_x of $x \in X$ is 1, then the pair (x, x) cannot contribute to neither inv'_U nor maj'_U. Therefore, omitting or adding such pairs to U doesn't change these two statistics over $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. For that purpose, we define U to be *essentially bipartitional relative to* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ if there are disjoint sets $I \subseteq X$ and $J \subseteq X$ such that

(1) $\alpha_x = 1$ for all $x \in I \cup J$ and

(2) $(U \setminus \{(x, x) \colon x \in I\}) \cup \{(x, x) \colon x \in J\}$ is bipartitional.

Theorem 2.1. *The statistics* inv'_U *and* maj'_U *are* equi**di**stributed *over* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *if and only if the relation* U *is essentially bipartitional relative to* α.

In view of the comment preceding the theorem, the"if" part of Theorem 2.1 follows from Theorem 1.1. We prove the "only if" in Section 3.

The third Mahonian statistic we will consider is the *sorting index* introduced by Peterson [16] and also studied independently by Wilson [20]. Every permutation $\sigma \in S_n$ can uniquely be decomposed as a product of transpositions, $\sigma = (i_1, j_1)(i_2, j_2) \cdots (i_k, j_k)$, such that $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k$ and $i_1 < j_1, i_2 < j_2, \ldots, i_k < j_k$. The sorting index is defined by

$$\mathrm{sor}\, \sigma = \sum_{r=1}^{k} (j_r - i_r).$$

The desired transposition decomposition can be found using the Straight Selection Sort algorithm. The algorithm first places n in the n-th position by applying a transposition, then places $n-1$ in the $(n-1)$-st position by applying a transposition, etc. For example, for $\sigma = 2413576$, we have

$$2413576 \overset{(67)}{\to} 2413567 \overset{(24)}{\to} 2314567 \overset{(23)}{\to} 2134567 \overset{(12)}{\to} 1234567$$

and, therefore, $\operatorname{sor}\sigma = (2-1)+(3-2)+(4-2)+(7-6) = 5$.

The sorting index has been extended to labeled forests by the authors [8]. It can also be naturally extended to words $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ by a generalization of Straight Selection Sort which reorders the letters into a weakly increasing sequence. At each step transpositions are applied to place all the n's at the end, then all the $n-1$'s to the left of them, etc, so that for each $x \in X$, the α_x copies of x stay in the same relative order they were right before they were "processed". Then we define $\operatorname{sor} w$ to be the sum of the number of positions each element moved during the sorting. For example, applying this sorting algorithm to $w = 143123123$ yields

$$143123123 \to 133123124 \to 123123134 \to 123121334 \to 121123334 \to 111223334 \tag{2.2}$$

and thus $\operatorname{sor} w = 7+2+3+4+2 = 18$.

We define a graphical sorting index that depends on U using the same sorting algorithm but at each step, when sorting x, we only count how many elements y such that $(x,y) \in U$ it "jumps over". More formally, to compute $\operatorname{sor}'_U w$ for $w = x_1 x_2 \dots x_m$:

- Begin with $i = m$, and $\operatorname{sor}'_U w = 0$.
- Consider the largest element in w with respect to integer order. If there is a tie, pick the element with the largest subscript, and call this element x_j.
- Interchange x_j with x_i.
- For each $h = j+1, j+2, \dots, i$, if $(x_j, x_h) \in U$ increase $\operatorname{sor}'_U w$ by 1.
- Repeat this process for $i = m-1, \dots, 1$.

For example, consider the same word $w = 143123123$ with $U = \{(4,3),(3,3),(3,1),(2,3),(1,1)\}$. The sorting steps are given in (2.2) and thus $\operatorname{sor}'_U w = 3+1+1+2+0 = 7$. In particular, if U is the natural integer order $>$ then $\operatorname{sor} w = \operatorname{sor}'_U w$. Our second main result is the following.

Theorem 2.2. *The statistics* sor'_U, inv'_U *and* maj'_U *are equidistributed on a fixed rearrangement class* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *if and only if the relation* U *has the following properties.*

1. *U is bipartitional with no underlined blocks,*
2. *If $(x,y) \in U$ then $x > y$,*
3. *All but the last block of U are of size at most 2,*
4. *If U has k blocks $B_1, \dots, B_k$ and $|B_i| = 2$ for some $1 \le i \le k-1$ then $\alpha_{\max B_i} = 1$.*

We give the proof of Theorem 2.2 in Section 4. We mention also that recently the question "When are sor and inv equidistributed on order ideals of the Bruhat order?" was recently addressed in [4].

3 The Proof of Theorem 2.1

We begin the proof with a simple observation.

Lemma 3.1. *The statistics* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed on* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *if and only if* maj'_{U^c} *and* inv'_{U^c} *are equidistributed on* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$.

Proof. This follows from the fact that for every $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$,

$$\mathrm{maj}'_U\, w + \mathrm{maj}'_{U^c}\, w = \binom{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|}{2} = \mathrm{inv}'_U\, w + \mathrm{inv}'_{U^c}\, w.$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *For any* $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ *and any relation* U *on* $X = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$,

$$\max_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathrm{maj}'_U\, w \geq \max_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathrm{inv}'_U\, w.$$

Proof. We will use induction on $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|$. It's clear that the statement holds when $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = 1$. Assume that it holds for all $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| \leq m$.

Consider a rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ such that $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = m+1$ and a relation U on $[n]$. Let $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U)$ be a directed graph with vertex set $\{1^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, n^{\alpha_n}\}$ and a directed edge $x \to y$ whenever $(x, y) \in U$. Let $x_1 \to x_2 \to \cdots \to x_n$ be a directed path in $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U)$ of maximal possible length. This means we have a descending chain $x_1 >_U x_2 >_U \cdots >_U x_l$ of maximal possible length. Set $\boldsymbol{\alpha}' = (\alpha'_1, \ldots, \alpha'_n)$ where

$$\alpha'_i = \alpha_i - \sum_{j=1}^{l} \mathcal{X}(x_j = i).$$

Let u' be a word that maximizes maj'_U on the rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$. One can easily verify that for the word $u = u' x_1 x_2 \cdots x_l$ in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ we have

$$\mathrm{maj}'_U\, u = \mathrm{maj}'_U\, u' + \frac{(l-1)(2m+2-l)}{2}. \tag{3.1}$$

To bound $\max_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathrm{inv}'_U\, w$, first suppose there is an element $y \in (\boldsymbol{\alpha}', U)$ is such that for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l$ we have $(y, x_i) \in U$ or $(x_i, y) \in U$. If $(y, x_1) \in U$ then $y >_U x_1 >_U x_2 >_U \cdots >_U x_l$ is a longer chain in $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U)$, therefore $(y, x_1) \notin U$ and $(x_1, y) \in U$. Similarly, if $(x_l, y) \in U$ we can form the longer chain $x_1 >_U x_2 >_U \cdots >_U x_l >_U y$ in $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U)$; thus we must have $(x_l, y) \notin U$ and $(y, x_l) \in U$. However, this implies that there are elements x_i and x_{i+1} such that $(x_i, y), (y, x_{i+1}) \in U$, which yields a longer chain $x_1 >_U x_2 >_U \cdots >_U x_i >_U y >_U x_{i+1} >_U \cdots >_U x_l$. Therefore, every $y \in (\boldsymbol{\alpha}', U)$ is related to at most $l-1$ elements in the chain $x_1 >_U \cdots >_U x_l$.

Now consider a word $v \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and the corresponding word $v' \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$ obtained by deleting $x_1, \ldots, x_l$. By the argument in the previous paragraph, the $m+1-l$ letters in v' create at most $(m+1-l)(l-1)$ graphical inversions with $x_1, \ldots, x_l$. Therefore, by (3.1) and the induction hypothesis,

$$\max_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \operatorname{inv}'_U w \le \max_{w'\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \operatorname{inv}'_U w + (m+1-l)(l-1) + \binom{l}{2} \tag{3.2}$$

$$= \max_{w'\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \operatorname{inv}'_U w + \frac{(l-1)(2m+2-l)}{2} \tag{3.3}$$

$$\le \max_{w'\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \operatorname{maj}'_U w + \frac{(l-1)(2m+2-l)}{2} \tag{3.4}$$

$$\le \max_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \operatorname{maj}'_U w. \tag{3.5}$$

□

The proof of Lemma 3.2 also shows that a word $w = w_k w_{k-1}\cdots w_1$ with the property $\operatorname{maj}'_U(w) \ge \max_{v\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \operatorname{inv}'_U v$ can be constructed by "peeling off" descending chains of maximal length from $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U)$ and ordering them from right to left, forming the subwords $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k$ in that order. These kind of words will be used in the proof and for a fixed relation U, we will call such words *maximal chain words* in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed on* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. *Let* $w = w_k w_{k-1}\cdots w_1 \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *be a maximal chain formed from the maximal chains* $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_k$. *Then*

(i) For each of the maximal descending chains $w_j = x_{i_{j-1}+1}x_{i_{j-1}+2}\cdots x_{i_j}$

$$(x_r, x_s) \in U \quad \text{or} \quad (x_s, x_r) \in U \quad \text{for all} \quad i_{j-1}+1 \le r < s \le i_j, \tag{3.6}$$

(ii) Each letter y *in a maximal descending chain* $w_i, i > j$, *is in relation with exactly* $i_j - 1$ *elements from* w_j, *i.e., there is a unique* $r \in \{i_{j-1}+1, \ldots, i_j\}$ *such that* $(y, x_r) \notin U$ *and* $(x_r, y) \notin U$. *Moreover,* $(x_s, y) \in U$ *for* $i_{j-1}+1 \le s < r$ *and* $(y, x_s) \in U$ *for* $r < s \le i_j$.

Proof. Condition (i) is necessary for equality to hold in (3.2). The property (ii) also follows from the fact that equality holds in (3.2) and the definition of a maximal chain word which implies that the chain w_j is be the longest one that can be formed among the letters in $w_k w_{k-1}\cdots w_j$. □

The following lemma shows that if maj'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ the elements in the maximal chains can be reordered, if necessary, so that within each of them the following property holds: if x precedes y in the same chain of a maximal chain word then $(x, y) \in U$.

Lemma 3.4. *If* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed on* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, *then there exists a maximal chain word* $w = w_k w_{k-1}\cdots w_1 \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *with subwords* w_i *formed from descending chains such that for any* $w_j = x_{i_{j-1}+1}x_{i_{j-1}+2}\cdots x_{i_j}$ *we have*

$$(x_r, x_s) \in U \quad \text{for all} \quad i_{j-1}+1 \le r < s \le i_j. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Since the equality in (3.2) holds, the elements $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_l$ in the maximal chain can be arranged so that they form $\binom{l}{2}$ graphical inversions, which implies the statement in the lemma. □

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed on* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. *Let* $w = w_k w_{k-1}\cdots w_1$ *be a maximal chain word in* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *for* U *with maximal chains* $w_1, \ldots, w_k$. *If* $(x, y) \in U$ *and* $(y, x) \in U$ *for some* $x \ne y$, *then the* x*'s and* y*'s are all in the same chain* w_i.

Proof. Without loss of generality, suppose there is an x that appears in a chain w_{j_1} and a y that appears in the chain w_{j_2}, $j_1 > j_2$. Consider the chain $w_{j_2} : b_1 >_U b_2 >_U \dots b_{l-1} >_U y >_U b_{l+1} >_U \cdots >_U b_m$. By Lemma 3.3, there is exactly one $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ such that $(x, b_i), (b_i, x) \notin U$, $(b_1, x), \dots, (b_{i-1}, x) \in U$, $(x, b_{i+1}), \dots, (x, b_m) \in U$. If $l < i$ then the chain $b_1 >_U b_2 >_U \cdots > b_{l-1} >_U x >_U y >_U b_{l+1} >_U \cdots >_U b_m$ is a longer chain than w_{j_2} and if $l > i$ then $b_1 >_U b_2 >_U \cdots >_U b_{l-1} >_U y >_U x >_U b_{l+1} >_U \cdots >_U b_m$ is a longer chain than w_{j_2}. This contradicts the definition of a maximal chain word.

□

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose there exists an element $x \in X$ with $\alpha_x \geq 1$ such that $U \subset (X \setminus \{x\}) \times (X \setminus \{x\})$ and $U \neq \emptyset$. Then inv'_U and maj'_U are not equidistributed over $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$.*

Proof. Set

$$\alpha'_i = \begin{cases} \alpha_i & \text{if } i \neq x, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = x. \end{cases}$$

Let $w' \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$ be the word such that $\mathrm{maj}'_U w' = \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \mathrm{maj}'_U u$. Consider the word $w = \underbrace{xx \cdots x}_{\alpha_x} w'$ in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Since x does not create any graphical inversions, by Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathrm{maj}'_U u \geq \mathrm{maj}'_U w &= \mathrm{maj}'_U w' + \alpha_x \, \mathrm{des}'_U w' \\ &= \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \mathrm{maj}'_U u + \alpha_x \, \mathrm{des}'_U w' \\ &\geq \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \mathrm{inv}'_U u + \alpha_x \, \mathrm{des}'_U w' \\ &= \max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} \mathrm{inv}'_U u + \alpha_x \, \mathrm{des}'_U w' \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if inv'_U and maj'_U are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, then $\mathrm{des}'_U w' = 0$ and thus

$$\max_{u \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} \mathrm{maj}\, u = 0.$$

This contradicts the fact that $U \neq \emptyset$.

□

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose maj'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. If $(x, y), (y, x) \in U$ and $\alpha_x > 1$ then $(x, x) \in U$.*

Proof. Since $(x, y), (y, x) \in U$, by Lemma 3.5, all the x's and y's must be in the same maximal chain of a maximal chain word. In particular, since two x's are in the same chain, part (i) of Lemma 3.3 implies that $(x, x) \in U$.

□

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose maj'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed over $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ and let x and y be two distinct elements of X such that $(x, y), (y, x) \in U$. For every $z \in \{1^{\alpha_1}, \dots, n^{\alpha_n}\} \setminus \{x, y\}$, we have*

$$(z, x) \in U \text{ if and only if } (z, y) \in U$$

and

$$(x, z) \in U \text{ if and only if } (y, z) \in U.$$

Proof. If $z = x$ then $\alpha_x > 1$ and the claim follows from Lemma 3.7. The same is true if $z = y$. So, suppose $z \neq x$, $z \neq y$. Because of symmetry, it suffices to prove

$$(z,x) \in U \implies (z,y) \in U \tag{3.8}$$
$$(x,z) \in U \implies (y,z) \in U \tag{3.9}$$

To see (3.8), suppose that $(z,x) \in U, (z,y) \notin U$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: $(y,z) \notin U$. Let $w = w_t w_{t-1} \cdots w_1 \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ be a maximal chain word that satisfies (3.7). By Lemma 3.5, x and y are in the same chain w_i of w. By Lemma 3.3, z is in a different chain w_j and by Lemma 3.5, $(x,z) \notin U$. If $j > i$, notice that, by Lemma 3.3, x cannot precede y in w_i, so w_i must be of the form $w_i = b_1 \cdots b_k y b_{k+1} \cdots b_l x b_{l+1} \cdots b_m$. Then $b_1 \cdots b_k z b_{k+1} \cdots b_l x y b_{l+1} \cdots b_m$ is a descending chain longer than w_i. If $j < i$, then $w_j = b_1 \cdots b_k z b_{k+1} \cdots b_l$. By part (ii) of Lemma 3.3, $(b_k, x), (y, b_{k+1}) \in U$, which implies that $b_1 \cdots b_k x y b_{k+1} \cdots b_l$ is a descending chain longer than w_j.

Case 2: $(y,z) \in U$. By Lemma 3.1, maj'_{U^c} and inv'_{U^c} are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Let $w = w_t w_{t-1} \cdots w_1 \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ be a maximal chain word for U^c that satisfies (3.7). Suppose x, y, z are in the chains w_i, w_j, w_k, respectively. By Lemma 3.3, $i \neq j$, $i \neq k$. If $i < j, k$ and $w_i = b_1 \cdots b_l x b_{l+1} \cdots b_m$ then a different maximal chain word w' could be constructed by taking the same chains $w_1, \ldots, w_{i-1}$ as in w and replacing w_i by $b_1 \cdots b_l y b_{l+1} \cdots b_m$. Since $(z,y) \in U^c$, it follows from Lemma 3.3 that z is not in relation U^c with some b_r, $r \leq l$ and therefore $(z,x) \in U^c$, which contradicts $(z,x) \in U$. The similar argument holds if $j < i, k$. If $k < i, j$ and $w_k = b_1 \cdots b_l z b_{l+1} \cdots b_m$ then y is not in relation U^c with some b_r, $r > l$, and a different maximal chain word for U^c could be formed by replacing w_k with $b_1 \cdots b_l z b_{l+1} \cdots b_{r-1} y b_{r+1} \cdots b_m$. Part (ii) of Lemma 3.3 now implies that $(z,x) \in U^c$, which contradicts $(z,x) \in U$. Finally, if $j = k < i$, then since $(z,x) \notin U^c$ and $(x,y), (y,x) \notin U^c$, Lemma 3.3 implies that $(x,z) \in U^c$ and y precedes z in w_j. Therefore, $(y,z) \in U^c$, which contradicts $(y,z) \notin U$.

The implication (3.9) can be proved by considering completely analogous cases, so we omit it here. □

For a relation U on X, call $S(U) = \{(x,y) \in X \times X : (x,y), (y,x) \in U\}$, the *symmetric* part of U, and call $A(U) = U \setminus S(U)$ the *asymmetric* part of U. Let $X_U = \{x \in X : (x,y) \in S(U) \text{ for some } y \in X\}$.

Lemma 3.9. *If* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed over a rearrangement class* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$*, then* $S(U) \cup \{(x,x) : x \in X_U, \alpha_x = 1\}$ *is an equivalence relation on* $X_U \times X_U$*.*

Proof. Let $x \in X_U$ and $y \in X$ such that $(x,y) \in U$. If $y = x$ then we have $(x,x) \in U$. If $y \neq x$ then we have $(x,y), (y,x) \in U$ and thus, if $\alpha_x > 1$ by Lemma 3.7 we have $(x,x) \in U$. $S(U)$ is symmetric by definition because $(x,y) \in S(U)$ implies $(y,x) \in S(U)$. Now consider $x, y, z \in X_U$ and assume $(x,y), (y,z) \in S(U)$. Then by definition of $S(U)$, $(y,x), (z,y) \in S(U)$ and Lemma 3.8 implies $(x,z) \in S(U)$. □

Consequently, X_U can be partitioned into blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_l$ such that

$$S(U) \cup \{(x,x) : x \in X_U, \alpha_x = 1\} = (B_1 \times B_1) \cup (B_2 \times B_2) \cup \cdots \cup (B_l \times B_l).$$

Lemma 3.10. *Suppose that* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed over a rearrangement class* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$*. Then either there is a block* B *of* X_U *such that*

$$\textit{for all } x \in B \textit{ and all } y \in X \setminus B \textit{ we have } (x,y) \notin U,$$

or there is an element

$$x \in X \setminus X_U \text{ such that for all } y \in X\setminus\{x\} \text{ we have } (x,y) \notin U.$$

Proof. Suppose that the lemma does not hold. In other words, assume that maj'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed over a rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, but for all blocks B_i of X_U there exists a $x \in B_i$ and $y \in X \setminus B_i$ such that $(x,y) \in U$, and for all $x \in X \setminus X_U$ there exists a $y \in X \setminus \{x\}$ such that $(x,y) \in U$.

Consider $x_0 \in X$. If $x_0 \in B_{i_0}$ for some $B_{i_0} \subset X_U$ there exists a $x_1 \in B_{i_0}$ and $x_2 \in X \setminus B_{i_0}$ such that $(x_0,x_1),(x_1,x_0) \in U$, and $(x_1,x_2) \in U$. Lemma 3.8 implies $(x_0,x_2) \in U$, and $(x_2,x_0) \notin U$ because if so $x_2 \in B_{i_0}$. Note that if we began with $x_0 \notin X_U$ our assumptions would still give an element $x_2 \in X \setminus \{x\}$ such that $(x_0,x_2) \in U$, and $(x_2,x_0) \notin U$ because $x_0 \notin X_U$. Now there are two cases to consider.

Case 1: $x_2 \in B_{i_1}$ for some $B_{i_1} \subset X_U$ and $B_{i_1} \neq B_{i_0}$. Then there exists a $x_3 \in B_{i_1}$ and $x_4 \notin B_{i_1}$ such that $(x_4,x_3) \in U$ and, by Lemma 3.8, $(x_2,x_4) \in U$ and $(x_4,x_2) \notin U$.

Case 2: $x_2 \notin X_U$, and then there exists a $x_4 \in X\setminus\{x_2\}$ such that $(x_2,x_4) \in U$ and $(x_4,x_2) \notin U$.

Continuing this process we can build a sequence $x_0,x_2,x_4,x_6,\ldots$ with the properties $x_0 >_U x_2 >_U x_4 >_U x_6 >_U \cdots$ and $x_0 \not<_U x_2 \not<_U x_4 \not<_U x_6 \not<_U \cdots$ with $x_{2i} \neq x_{2i+2}$ for all i.

The set X is finite and thus this sequence can not be infinite with distinct terms. Therefore, with relabeling there is a finite sequence $y_1,y_2,y_3,\ldots,y_{l+1}$ such that

- $l \geq 2$
- all y_i's are distinct for $i = 1,2,\ldots,l$
- $y_1 >_U y_2 >_U (y_3 >_U y_4 >_U \cdots >_U y_l >_U y_{l+1} = y_1$
- $y_1 \not<_U y_2 \not<_U y_3 \not<_U y_4 \not<_U \cdots \not<_U y_l \not<_U y_{l+1} = y_1$

If $l = 2$ then we have $y_1 <_U y_2 <_U y_1$ and $y_1 \not<_U y_2 \not<_U y_1$ which is a contradiction and hence $l \geq 3$.

Let $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ be a maximal chain word for U. If all $y_1,\ldots,y_l$ appear in the same chain w_i, then by Lemma 3.4, they can be relabeled to give a sequence $z_1,\ldots,z_l$ such that $(z_r,z_s) \in U$ for all $1 \leq r < s \leq l$. If $z_l = y_i$, then this means that $y_{i+1} >_U y_i$, which is a contradiction. If not all all $y_1,\ldots,y_l$ appear in the same chain let y_j be the one that appears in the rightmost chain of w. Then either y_{j+1} is already in the same chain or its not related to an element to the right of y_j. In the latter case, another maximal chain word can be constructed in which y_j and y_{j+1} are in the same chain, while the other y_i's are either in the same chain or in chains to the left. Continuing this argument, we see that we can construct a maximal chain word in which all $y_1,\ldots,y_l$ are in the same chain, which as we saw before is impossible.

□

Let $C = \{x \in X \setminus X_U \colon \alpha_x > 1, (x,y) \notin U, \forall y \in X \text{ or } \alpha_x = 1, (x,y) \notin U, \forall y \in X \setminus \{x\}\}$.

Lemma 3.11. *Suppose that* maj'_U *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed over a rearrangement class* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. *If* C *is nonempty then*

$$\text{for all } y \in X \setminus C \text{ and for all } x \in C \text{ we have } (y,x) \in U.$$

If C is empty and B is the block defined in Lemma 3.10 then

$$\textit{for all } y \in X \setminus B \textit{ and for all } x \in B \textit{ we have } (y,x) \in U.$$

Proof. Suppose C is nonempty, and that the claim does not hold. In other words assume that there exists a $y \in X \setminus C$ and $x \in C$ such that $(y,x) \notin U$. Now $y \notin C$ so there exists a $z \in X$ such that $(y,z) \in U$. Notice that we may have $y = z$ if $y \in X_U$, but then $\alpha_y > 1$, and $z \neq x$ by assumption. Now we have $(y,z) \in U$, $(y,x) \notin U$, and $(x,y),(x,z) \notin U$ since $x \in C$. Since $(x,y),(y,x) \notin U$, and $(x,z) \notin U$, Lemma 3.8 applied to U^c yields $(y,z) \notin U$, which is a contradiction.

Now suppose C is empty, B is the block defined in Lemma 3.10, and the claim does not hold. In other words, there exists a $y \in X \setminus B$ and $x \in B$ such that $(y,x) \notin U$. Since $y \notin B$, and C is nonempty there must be an element z such that $(y,z) \in U$. Now we have $(y,z) \in U$, $(y,x) \notin U$, and $(x,y),(x,z) \notin U$ since $x \in B$. Therefore, the same argument as above gives a contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1 . Theorem 2.1 can be proved using induction on the size of the set X. Suppose first that $C \neq \emptyset$. Then, by Lemma 3.11, $C \times X = \emptyset$ and $(X \setminus C) \times C \subset U$. Consider inv'_U and maj'_U over the rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$ of the permutations of the multiset $\{x^{\alpha_x} : x \in X \setminus C\}$. Inserting the elements from C in all possible ways among the letters of a word $w' \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$ results in a set of words $S(w') \subset \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. It is not hard to see that as w ranges over $S(w')$, the difference $\mathrm{inv}'_U w - \mathrm{inv}'_U w'$ ranges over the multiset $\{i_1 + i_2 + \cdots + i_r : 0 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \cdots \leq i_l \leq s\}$ where $r = |\alpha(C)|$ and $s = |\alpha(X \setminus C)|$. The same is true for the difference $\mathrm{maj}'_U w - \mathrm{maj}'_U w'$. This is less obvious but follows from a similar property of the classical major index for words (see e.g. [2, Lemma 4.6] for a proof). Let $U_1 = U \cap ((X \setminus C) \times (X \setminus C))$ be the restriction of U on $X \setminus C$. For $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$, $\mathrm{inv}'_U w = \mathrm{inv}'_{U_1} w$ and $\mathrm{maj}'_U w = \mathrm{maj}'_{U_1} w$. So,

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_U w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ |C| \end{bmatrix} \binom{|C|}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(C)} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_{U_1} w}$$
$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{maj}'_U w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ |C| \end{bmatrix} \binom{|C|}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(C)} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} q^{\mathrm{maj}'_{U_1} w}.$$

Thus if inv'_U and sor'_U are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ then inv'_{U_1} and maj'_{U_1} are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$. By the induction hypothesis, U_1 is essentially bipartitional relative to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$ and thus U is essentially bipartitional relative to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with one more non-underlined block C.

In the case when $C = \emptyset$ there is a block B such that $B \times (X \setminus B)$ is empty and $X \times B \subset U$. Then we consider the relation $U_1 = U \cap ((X \setminus B) \times (X \setminus B))$ on $X \setminus B$. Similar reasoning as above yields

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_U w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ |B| \end{bmatrix} \binom{|B|}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(B)} q^{\binom{|B|}{2}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_{U_1} w}$$
$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{maj}'_U w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ |B| \end{bmatrix} \binom{|B|}{\boldsymbol{\alpha}(B)} q^{\binom{|B|}{2}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')} q^{\mathrm{maj}'_{U_1} w}.$$

So, U_1 is essentially bipartitional relative to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}'$ and thus U is essentially bipartitional relative to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ with one more underlined block B. □

4 Graphical Sorting Index

In this section we will prove Theorem 2.2. The "if" part follows from the following proposition and (2.1), while the "only if" part follows from Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.5.

Proposition 4.1. *If the relation U satisfies the properties of Theorem 2.2 and has blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ then*

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{sor}'_U w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ m_1, \ldots, m_k \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \binom{m_j}{\alpha(B_j)}.$$

Proof. We will prove the statement using a B-code for the words in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ that we define. Let $w = x_1 x_2 \ldots x_l \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. B-code w is a pair of two sequences: a sequence of partitions and a sequence of nonnegative integers. Precisely, we define B-code w to be

$$((b_{1,1} \geq b_{1,2} \geq \ldots \geq b_{1,m_1}; b_{2,1} \geq b_{2,2} \geq \cdots \geq b_{2,m_2}; \ldots; b_{k,1} \geq b_{k,2} \geq \ldots \geq b_{k,m_k}), (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k))$$

where

(1°) for $i < k$ each partition $b_{i,1} \geq \ldots \geq b_{i,m_i} \geq 0$ each part has size $b_{i,j} \leq m_{i+1} + m_{i+2} + \cdots + m_k$, $1 \leq j \leq m_i$, while $b_{k,j} = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq m_k$,

(2°) $p_i = 0$ if $|B_i| = 1$ and $1 \leq p_i \leq m_i$ if $|B_i| = 2$.

B-code w is computed as follows.

(1) Set $j = 1$.

(2) If $B_j = \{y_1, y_2\}$ has two integers $y_2 > y_1$ then let $p_j = i$ be the position of y_2 in the subword of w formed by the elements of B_j. Otherwise set $p_j = 0$.

(3) Sort the elements of the block B_j and form the partition $b_{j,1} \geq \ldots \geq b_{j,m_j} \geq 0$ from the contributions to sor w (listed in nonincreasing order) by the elements of B_j. Keep calling the partially sorted word w.

(4) If $j < k$ increase j by 1 and go to step (2). Otherwise stop.

Consider, for example, the relation $U = \{(5,3), (5,2), (5,1), (4,3), (4,2), (4,1), (3,2), (3,1)\}$ which is bipartitional with blocks $B_1 = \{5,4\}, B_2 = \{3\}, B_3 = \{2,1\}$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = 0$. Let $w = 42345411 \in \mathcal{R}(2,1,1,3,1)$. Snce the subword formed by the 4's and the 5 is 4454, we have $p_1 = 3$. The steps for sorting the 4's and the 5 are

$$4234541 \overset{+1}{\to} 42341415 \overset{+1}{\to} 42341145 \overset{+2}{\to} 42311445 \overset{+4}{\to} 12314445$$

and, therefore, the first partition in B-code w is $4 \geq 2 \geq 1 \geq 1$. Then $p_2 = 0$ and sorting the 3 yields 12134445, therefore the second partition is 1. Finally, $p_3 = 2$ and

$$\text{B-code}\, w = ((4 \geq 2 \geq 1 \geq 1; 1; 0 \geq 0 \geq 0), (3, 0, 2)).$$

Since the parts of the partitions in the B-code represent contributions to the sorting index, the bound for their size $b_{i,j} \leq m_{i+1} + m_{i+2} + \cdots + m_k$ easily follows. Therefore, the B-code is clearly a map from $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ to the set of pairs of sequences of partitions and integers which satisfy (1°) and (2°), which we claim is a bijection. For describing the inverse, the crucial observation is that for blocks of size 2, $B_j = \{y_1 < y_2\}$, the contribution to the sorting index is given by b_{j,p_j}. Then given

$$((b_{1,1} \geq b_{1,2} \geq \ldots \geq b_{1,m_1}; b_{2,1} \geq b_{2,2} \geq \cdots \geq b_{2,m_2}; \ldots; b_{k,1} \geq b_{k,2} \geq \ldots \geq b_{k,m_k}), (p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k))$$

which satisfies (1°) and (2°), the corresponding word $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is constructed as follows.

(1) Let $j = k$ and w be the empty word.

(2) Add to the end of w the elements of B_j with their multiplicities, listed in nondecreasing order $x_{j,1}x_{j,2}\cdots x_{j,m_j}$.

(3) If $|B_j| = 1$, then for $i = 1, \ldots, m_j$, swap $x_{j,i}$ with the element of w which is $b_{j,i}$ places to the left of $x_{j,i}$.

(4) If $B_j = \{y_1 < y_2\}$, then let $b'_{j,1} \geq \cdots \geq b'_{j,m_j-1}$ be the partition obtained from $b_{j,1} \geq \ldots \geq b_{j,m_j}$ by deleting the part b_{j,p_j}. Then for $i = 1, \ldots, m_j - 1$, swap $x_{j,i}$ with the element of w which is $b'_{j,i}$ places to the left of $x_{j,i}$. Finally, swap $x_{j,m_j} = y_2$ with the element in w which is $b_{j,p_j} + m_j - p_j$ positions to its left. (After this step there are b_{j,p_j} elements from $B_{j+1}, \ldots, B_k$ and $m_j - p_j$ elements from B_j to the right of y_2.)

(5) If $j > 1$ decrease j by 1 and go to step (2). Otherwise stop.

The B-code is designed so that $\mathrm{sor}'_U w = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} b_{i,j}$. The bijection described above then yields the generating function for sor'_U. Let $p(j,k,n)$ denote the number of partitions of n into at most k parts, with largest part at most j. It is known that $\sum_{n\geq 0} p(j,k,n)q^n = \begin{bmatrix} j+k \\ j \end{bmatrix}$. The block B_j contributes

$$\binom{m_j}{\alpha(B_j)} \sum_{n\geq 0} p(m_{j+1} + m_{j+2}\cdots + m_n, m_j, n)q^n = \binom{m_j}{\alpha(B_j)} \begin{bmatrix} m_j + m_{j+1}\cdots + m_n \\ m_j \end{bmatrix}$$

to $\sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{sor}'_U w}$, where the leading binomial coefficient counts the number of possible values of p_j. Thus we have

$$\sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{sor}'_U w} = \prod_{j=1}^{k} \binom{m_j}{\alpha(B_j)} \begin{bmatrix} m_j + m_{j+1}\cdots + m_n \\ m_j \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ m_1, \ldots, m_k \end{bmatrix} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \binom{m_j}{\alpha(B_j)}.$$

□

In particular, we get the generating function for the standard sorting index for words.

Corollary 4.2.

$$\sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{sor}\, w} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha| \\ m_1, \ldots, m_k \end{bmatrix}.$$

Finally, we prove the "only if" part of Theorem 2.2 via the following few lemmas.

Lemma 4.3. *If* sor'_U, maj'_U, *and* inv'_U *are equidistributed over a fixed rearrangement class* $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ *then the relation* U *must be a subset of the integer order modulo relations* (x, x).

Proof. Suppose sor'_U, maj'_U, and inv'_U are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. By Theorem 2.1, U must be essentially bipartitional relative to α. That means that there are subsets $I, J \subset \{x\colon \alpha_{x=1}\}$ such that $U' = (U \setminus \{(x,x)\colon x \in I\}) \cup \{(x,x)\colon x \in J\}$ is bipartitional. Without loss of generality we may assume that I, J are chosen so that U' does not have underlined blocks $\{x\}$ of size 1 such that $\alpha_x = 1$. We claim that U' is a subset of the natural order.

First we will show that there are no underlined blocks in U'. Suppose the contrary. Then there exist elements x and y such that $(x,y),(y,x) \in U'$ ($x \neq y$ or y is a second copy of the same element with $\alpha_x > 1$). Because we have both (x,y) and (y,x) in U' every word $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ has at least one U'-inversion. Therefore the minimum inv'_U over the rearrangement class $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is 1. On the other hand, $\mathrm{sor}'_U\, 11\cdots 122\cdots 2\cdots nn\cdots n = 0$. This is a contradiction, and thus there are no underlined blocks in U'.

Now assume that U' is not a subset of the natural integer order. Then there exist at least two elements such that $(x,y) \in U'$, but $y > x$ with respect to the natural order. Let $B_1, B_2, \ldots, B_k$ be the blocks of U'. Now consider the words created by placing the elements of B_1 in some order followed by the elements of B_2 placed to the right of B_1 and continue the process until the elements of B_k in some order are the last elements of the word. The words of this type will have inv'_U equal to the number of edges in the graph $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U')$ as defined in the proof of Lemma 3.2. Therefore, the maximum inv'_U is bounded below by the number of edges in $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U')$ (it is in fact equal to the number of edges in $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U')$). In the sorting algorithm, however, elements are only sorted over elements that are smaller than them with respect to the natural order. Therefore x will never jump over y, and thus the relation (x,y) will never contribute to the sorting index. Since each edge of the graph $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, U')$ contributes at most 1 to sor'_U, we conclude that the maximum sor'_U on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is less than the maximum inv'_U. This is a contradiction, and U' must be a subset of the natural order. □

The next inequality will be used to prove the remaining part of Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 4.4. *For* $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{a}{i} \leq \binom{a+b}{b}$$

and equality holds if and only if $b = 1$.

Proof. If $a \leq b$ then using the Vandermonde's Identity we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{a}{i} = \sum_{i=0}^{a} \binom{a}{i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{a} \binom{a}{i}\binom{b}{a-i} = \binom{a+b}{b}$$

and equality holds if and only if $a = b = 1$. Similarly, if $a > b$ then

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\min\{a,b\}} \binom{a}{i} = \sum_{i=0}^{b} \binom{a}{i} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{b} \binom{a}{i}\binom{b}{b-i} = \binom{a+b}{b}$$

□

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose U is a bipartitional relation with blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_k$, none of which are underlined, such that sor'_U, maj'_U, and inv'_U are equidistributed over $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Then for every $1 \leq i < k$, $|B_i| \leq 2$ and if the equality $|B_i| = 2$ holds then $\alpha_{\max B_i} = 1$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, the blocks $B_1, \ldots, B_k$ are consecutive intervals with $n \in B_1$ and $1 \in B_k$. If $k = 1$ there is nothing to prove, so suppose $k > 1$.

Let $\mathrm{i}(B_1, \ldots B_k)$ and $\mathrm{s}(B_1, \ldots, B_k)$ denote the number of words in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ that maximize inv'_U and sor'_U, respectively. Let $B_1 = \{s, s+1, \ldots, n\}$, $s \leq n-1$. The words in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ that maximize inv'_U are exactly those formed by a permutation of the elements of B_1 (with their multiplicities) followed by a permutation of the elements from B_2, etc. So, $\mathrm{i}(B_1, \ldots, B_k) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \binom{m_i}{\alpha(B_i)}$.

On the other hand, if $w \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ maximizes sor'_U then after sorting the n's, one obtains a word $w' \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$ that maximizes sor'_U for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}' = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1})$. The map $w \to w'$ is not one-to-one. One can write $w' = uv$ where u is the longest prefix of w' formed by elements of B_1. Then the number of words w that yield w' is at most $\sum_{i=0}^{\min\{|u|,\alpha_n\}} \binom{|u|}{i}$. Namely, such a w can be obtained by appending the α_n copies of n to w' and then swapping the leftmost i copies of n with i letters from u and the remaining $\alpha_n - i$ copies of n with the first $\alpha_n - i$ letters of v.

Since, by Lemma 4.4,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\min\{|u|,\alpha_n\}} \binom{|u|}{i} \leq \binom{|u| + \alpha_n}{\alpha_n} \leq \binom{\alpha_n + \alpha_{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_s}{\alpha_n}$$

with equality when $\alpha_n = 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{s}(B_1, \ldots, B_k) \leq \binom{\alpha_n + \alpha_{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_s}{\alpha_n} \mathrm{s}(B_1 \setminus \{n\}, \ldots, B_k),$$

where $\mathrm{s}(B_1 \setminus \{n\}, \ldots, B_k)$ is the number of words in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$ that maximize sor'_U. So, inductively, we get

$$\mathrm{s}(B_1, \ldots, B_k) \leq \binom{\alpha_n + \alpha_{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_s}{\alpha_s, \ldots, \alpha_{n-1}, \alpha_n} \mathrm{s}(B_2, \ldots, B_k) \leq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \binom{m_i}{\alpha(B_i)} = \mathrm{i}(B_1, \ldots, B_k).$$

Since we have equalities everywhere, $\alpha_n = 1$. We also get that $\mathrm{s}(B_1 \setminus \{n\}, \ldots, B_k) = \mathrm{i}(B_1 \setminus \{n\}, \ldots, B_k)$ and by the same argument, $\alpha_n = \alpha_{n-1} = \cdots = \alpha_{s+1} = 1$.

Now consider a permutation p of the multiset $\{1^{\alpha_1}, 2^{\alpha_2}, \ldots, s-1^{\alpha_{s-1}}\}$ which maximizes sor'_U. By appending α_s copies of s to p and then swapping them with the first α_s letters of p we get the word

$$\underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s} p'.$$

One can readily see that the word

$$w' = (n-1)\underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s - 1} p' s(s+1)(s+2)\cdots(n-2) \in \mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$$

maximizes sor'_U over $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}')$. Also, there are exactly $\alpha_s + 1$ words w in $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ that maximize sor'_U which can be obtained from w', namely,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&n \underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s-1} p's(s+1)(s+2)\cdots(n-2)(n-1),\\
&(n-1)n \underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s-2} p's(s+1)(s+2)\cdots(n-2)s,\\
&(n-1)sn \underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s-3} p's(s+1)(s+2)\cdots(n-2)s,\\
&\cdots\\
&(n-1) \underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s-2} np's(s+1)(s+2)\cdots(n-2)s,\\
&(n-1) \underbrace{ss\cdots s}_{\alpha_s-1} np''s(s+1)(s+2)\cdots(n-2)a,
\end{aligned}
$$

where a is the first letter of p'. However, as we saw above, if sor'_U and inv'_U are equidistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$, each word w' corresponds to exactly $\binom{\alpha_n+\alpha_{n-1}+\cdots+\alpha_s}{\alpha_n}$ words w. So,

$$\binom{\alpha_n + \alpha_{n-1} + \cdots + \alpha_s}{\alpha_n} = \alpha_s + 1$$

and therefore $s = n - 1$.

This proves that either $B_1 = \{n-1, n\}$ with $\alpha_n = 1$ or $B_1 = \{n\}$. Since the block is of this form, reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 4.1 one can see that

$$\sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{sor}'_U w} = \binom{m_1}{\alpha(B_1)} \begin{bmatrix} m_1 + m_2 \cdots + m_n \\ m_j \end{bmatrix} \sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}'')} q^{\mathrm{sor}'_U w},$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}'')$ is the set of all permutations of the elements of $B_2, \ldots, B_k$ with the multiplicities given by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Since

$$\sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_U w} = \binom{m_1}{\alpha(B_1)} \begin{bmatrix} m_1 + m_2 \cdots + m_n \\ m_j \end{bmatrix} \sum_{w\in\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}'')} q^{\mathrm{inv}'_U w},$$

we conclude that sor'_U and inv'_U are equdistributed on $\mathcal{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}'')$ and inductively, we get that each of the remaining blocks $B_2, \ldots, B_{k-1}$ has either size 1 or size 2 with the multiplicity of the largest element being 1. □

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

References

[1] W.Y.C. Chen, G.Z. Gong, and J.J.F. Guo. The sorting index and permutation codes. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 50(3):367–389, 2013.

[2] W.Y.C. Chen, S. Poznanović, C.H. Yan, and A.L.B. Yang. Major index for 01-fillings of moon polyominoes. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 117(8):1058–1081, 2010.

[3] B. Clarke. A note on some Mahonian statistics. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 53:B53a, 2005.

[4] N.J.Y Fan, L. He, T.X.S. Li, and A.F.Y. Zhao. The sorting index and inversion number on order ideals of permutation groups. *Discrete Math.*, 339(10):2490–2499, 2016.

[5] D. Foata. On the Netto inversion number of a sequence. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 236–240, 1968.

[6] D. Foata and C. Krattenthaler. Graphical major indices, II. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.*, 34:B34k, 1995.

[7] D. Foata and D. Zeilberger. Graphical major indices. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*, 68(1):79–101, 1996.

[8] A. Grady and S. Poznanović. Sorting index and mahonian-stirling pairs for labeled forests. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, in press.

[9] G.-N. Han. Ordres bipartitionnaires et statistiques sur les mots. *Electronic J. Combin.*, 1995.

[10] G. Hetyei and C. Krattenthaler. The poset of bipartitions. *European J. Combin.*, 32(8):1253–1281, 2011.

[11] K.W.J. Kadell. Weighted inversion numbers, restricted growth functions, and standard young tableaux. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 40(1):22–44, 1985.

[12] A. Kasraoui. A classification of Mahonian maj-inv statistics. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 42(3):342–357, 2009.

[13] P.A. MacMahon. The indices of permutations and the derivation therefrom of functions of a single variable associated with the permutations of any assemblage of objects. *Amer. J. Math.*, 281–322, 1913.

[14] P.A. MacMahon. Two applications of general theorems in combinatory analysis:(1) to the theory of inversions of permutations;(2) to the ascertainment of the numbers of terms in the development of a determinant which has amongst its elements an arbitrary number of zeros. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 2(1):314–321, 1917.

[15] P.A. MacMahon. *Combinatory Analysis*. Courier Corporation, 1984.

[16] T.K. Petersen. The sorting index. *Adv. Appl. Math.*, 47(3):615–630, 2011.

[17] S. Poznanović. The sorting index and equidistribution of set-valued statistics over restricted permutations. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 125:254–272, 2014.

[18] D. Rawlings. The r-major index. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A*, 31(2):175–183, 1981.

[19] O. Rodriguez. Note sur les inversions, ou dérangements produits dans les permutations. *J. de Math.*, 4(1839):236–240, 1839.

[20] M.C. Wilson. An interesting new Mahonian permutation statistic. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 17(1):R147, 2010.